U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 34888057

Date: NOV. 04, 2024

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (National Interest Waiver)

The Petitioner, a barber, seeks employment-based second preference (EB-2) immigrant classification as an individual of exceptional ability, as well as a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement attached to this classification. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(2), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).

The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the record did not establish that that the proposed endeavor was of national importance, that the Petitioner is well positioned to advance the endeavor, or that it would be beneficial to waive the requirements of a job offer. The matter is now before us on appeal pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). Upon de novo review, we will withdraw the Director's decision and remand the matter for entry of a new decision consistent with the following analysis.

I. LAW

To qualify for the underlying EB-2 visa classification, a petitioner must establish they are an advanced degree professional or an individual of exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business. Section 203(b)(2)(A) of the Act.

Exceptional ability means a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered in the sciences, arts, or business. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2). A petitioner must initially submit documentation that satisfies at least three of six categories of evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(ii)(A)-(F).[1] Meeting at least three criteria, however, does not, in and of itself, establish eligibility for this classification.[2] If a petitioner does so, we will then conduct a final merits determination to decide whether the evidence

[1] If these types of evidence do not readily apply to the individual's occupation, a petitioner may submit comparable evidence to establish their eligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(iii).

[2] USCIS has previously confirmed the applicability of this two-part adjudicative approach in the context of individuals of exceptional ability. 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.5(B)(2), https://www.uscis.gov/policy-manual/volume-6-part-f-chapter-5.

in its totality shows that they are recognized as having the requisite degree of expertise and will substantially benefit the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States. Section 203(b)(2)(A) of the Act.

If a petitioner establishes eligibility for the underlying EB-2 classification, they must then demonstrate that they merit a discretionary waiver of the job offer requirement "in the national interest." Section 203(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Act. *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. 884, 889 (AAO 2016), provides the framework for adjudicating national interest waiver petitions. *Dhanasar* states that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion,[3] grant a national interest waiver if the petitioner demonstrates that:

- The proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance;
- The individual is well-positioned to advance their proposed endeavor; and
- On balance, waiving the job offer requirement would benefit the United States.

Id.

II. ANALYSIS

The Director determined that the record did not establish the Petitioner's eligibility under any of the prongs of the *Dhanasar* framework, and therefore found him ineligible for a waiver of the job offer requirement.[4] For the reasons discussed below, we will withdraw the Director's decision and remand the matter to the Director for entry of a new decision.

A. Substantial Merit and National Importance

The first prong, substantial merit and national importance, focuses on the specific endeavor that the individual proposes to undertake. The endeavor's merit may be demonstrated in a range of areas such as business, entrepreneurialism, science, technology, culture, health, or education. In determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, we consider its potential prospective impact. *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889.

In the decision, the Director analyzed the substantial merit of a proposed endeavor involving mechanical engineering. This is not the Petitioner's endeavor. The Petitioner is a barber and entrepreneur. The Director also misquoted the request for evidence's (RFE) discussion on national importance. The Director's decision then determined that the Petitioner's endeavor was not nationally important without sufficient analysis of the record.

In determining national importance, the relevant question is not the importance of the industry or profession in which the individual will work; instead we focus on the "the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake." *See Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. In *Dhanasar*, we further noted that "we look for broader implications" of the proposed endeavor and that "[a]n undertaking

[3] *See Flores v. Garland*, 72 F.4th 85, 88 (5th Cir. 2023) (joining the Ninth, Eleventh, and D.C. Circuit Courts in concluding that USCIS' decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver is discretionary in nature).
[4] The Director's decision seems to have reserved discussion of the visa classification.

may have national importance for example, because it has national or even global implications within a particular field." *Id.* We also stated that "[a]n endeavor that has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or has other substantial positive economic effects, particularly in an economically depressed area, for instance, may well be understood to have national importance." *Id.* at 890.

The Petitioner stated that for his proposed endeavor he intends to establish a beauty salon and act as a hairdresser instructor. The reach of such an endeavor appears limited to the Petitioner's clients and students. Because the Director's decision contained inaccurate information and conclusory analysis, we are withdrawing the determination and remanding the case for further review and to provide an accurate and sufficient explanation of the grounds of denial so that the Petitioner can more fully understand the Director's concerns.

B. Well Positioned to Advance the Proposed Endeavor

The second prong shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the individual. To determine whether they are well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor, we consider factors including, but not limited to: their education, skills, knowledge and record of success in related or similar efforts; a model or plan for future activities; any progress towards achieving the proposed endeavor; and the interest of potential customers, users, investors, or other relevant entities or individuals. *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 890.

The Director determined that the Petitioner did not establish this prong. In the evaluation of the evidence, the Director determined that the Petitioner has not influenced the field beyond the companies who employed him and that his academic accomplishments were insufficient to demonstrate that he is well positioned. The Director did not explain how the Petitioner's academic history precluded the Petitioner from being well positioned. In general, the Director did not identify and analyze what evidence in the record specifically made the Petitioner ill prepared to advance the proposed endeavor.

On remand, the Director should identify and analyze the evidence to determine whether the record sufficiently demonstrates whether or not the Petitioner is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor.

C. Whether on Balance a Waiver is Beneficial

The third prong requires a petitioner to demonstrate that, on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification. In performing this analysis, we may evaluate factors such as: whether, in light of the nature of the individual's qualifications or the proposed endeavor, it would be impractical either for them to secure a job offer or to obtain a labor certification; whether, even assuming that other qualified U.S. workers are available, the United States would still benefit from their contributions; and whether the national interest in their contributions is sufficiently urgent to warrant forgoing the labor certification process. In each case, the factors considered must, taken together, establish that on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification. *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 890-91.

On remand, if the Director concludes that the Petitioner does not meet *Dhanasar's* third prong, the decision should address the Petitioner's arguments and evidence, and explain the relative decisional weight given to each balancing factor.

ORDER: The Director's decision is withdrawn. The matter is remanded for the entry of a new decision consistent with the foregoing analysis.